

Alan Stone's Contributions to Ethics in Forensic Psychiatry

This is an unusual edition of the *Journal*, at least during my term as editor. It is not common or usual for us to address a single theme. This number is centered on the thinking of Alan Stone, who is the Touroff-Glueck Professor of Law and Psychiatry at Harvard University. Stone gave a traditional luncheon lecture at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law (AAPL) on October 22, 1982. To hear tell from older AAPL members, Stone's words shook the rafters and provoked responses from many quarters. This lecture was later published in the 1984 edition of the *Bulletin of the AAPL*, accompanied by commentaries from nine of Stone's colleagues. I must confess it was years later that I came across Stone's published speech and after a concentrated reading was captivated by the implications of what he said for my own work.

It was Glenn Miller who suggested the organization of a panel at the 2007 Annual AAPL Meeting that would concentrate first on having Stone articulate where the evolution of his ideas presented 25 years earlier had led him. Miller also recommended that three scholars who had monitored and responded to Stone's ideas—Paul Appelbaum, Stephen Morse, and I—should respond at the panel with commentaries.

The next step was inevitable—that the presentations be published. After discussion, it was thought useful to reprint here as a special article the initial

1984 publication. The following have been added to that: a piece by Joseph Bloom and Daniel Dick that refreshes our memories about the social and psychiatry context of the early 1980s and that is relevant to an informed understanding of Stone's reflections at the time; and two summaries of the commentaries published in 1984—one by Charles Dike and the other by Don Grubin.

I had hoped to publish as a regular article Stone's recent speech at the 2007 AAPL Annual Meeting. That was not possible. Nevertheless, included here are the commentaries presented by the three colleagues at that meeting, in addition to Miller's introduction.

I believe Stone's thinking has had a powerful effect on the discipline of forensic psychiatry. Thus, I hope that our readers, especially our trainees, will be pleased to encounter this 25-year excursion in a single issue of our periodical. In addition, though, this is an especial celebration of a man who rocked the foundation of our profession but then provoked us to find ways to stabilize and solidify it. Even as I disagree with his argumentation, I acknowledge that we cannot ignore his contributions to the debate about ethics in forensic psychiatry. Indeed, the elegance and disciplined organization of his ideas deserve celebration on these pages.

Ezra E. H. Griffith, MD